

*Supply—Post Office*

are over a year old. We do not get the true picture of how the department is operating this year. The hon. member for Notre Dame de Grace dealt with an analysis of the figures, and I do not need to say any more about that except that there was an increase in revenue this year of \$21 million. He suggested that if the double delivery postal service were restored it would probably make it come out right.

I should like to repeat what I said some two years ago, that I am much more enamoured of the technique adopted by the Postmaster General who made this a hobby, Sir William Mulock, who always provided service and increased efficiency. As the surplus mounted and mounted, he gave it back to the people who were paying for the service. In this particular case the department is working in reverse. They are anticipating there is going to be a loss, and they make the people pay for that loss. It just proves to me that the technique employed by Sir William Mulock was the right one, particularly when they follow the recommendation of the Woods-Gordon report and find that they begin to get results. This is only the first year that we are able to say they have had the benefit of the Woods-Gordon report. We shall probably have to wait till next year to get the full picture of how it is operating. I shall leave it at that for now.

The matter brought up by the hon. member for Kootenay West is an intriguing one. In regard to the postage stamps, I thought it was satire they were trying to achieve. Two years ago, I believe, I mentioned that they had brought out a new series of stamps, and they had a goose that was very effectively done. I am not criticizing the art work of the stamps, because it is very difficult to get good artistic results for a very small stamp. The original art work has to be about ten or 20 times the size of the stamp, and it is difficult to reduce it perfectly. As far as the subject matter is concerned I did not think it was humorous; I thought it was satire. When they brought in the higher postage rates I thought they were using the symbol of the goose that laid the golden eggs, because the public was the goose. It was getting the revenue from the public, who were not getting anything in return for it.

Last year they introduced another wildlife subject. I suggested that I thought it would be a very good idea if, instead of a walrus, they had taken a fish—a good slimy, slippery fish, a sucker—and probably that would be symbolic of what they were using the people

[Mr. Small.]

of Canada for. I should say there were a lot of suckers, because the rates were put up instead of being reduced and the surplus bounced.

This year I presumed they took my words to heart and decided to carry this lesson of symbolism to the people. Instead of giving them a fish they gave them a goat. It did not matter whether the art work was good. They got the story over, that they were using the people of Canada as the goat because they were still mulcting them for the higher rates of postage which they should not be charging.

Earlier in the year the hon. member for Peterborough brought up a matter with respect to that city, where they were quite concerned about this all-seeing eye or viewing gallery, as they call it, in the post office. Again another satirical thought occurred to me. When the Minister of Justice was discussing some of the criminal offences that were mentioned at that particular time he went down through the categories of offences of people who were becoming a nuisance, who had jail terms, who were in and out of prison and who were known to be repeaters or habitual offenders. He classified them as peeping toms if they were habitually going around schools or public places.

I suppose you would call a post office a public place. It is in the discretion of the postmaster of a particular post office whether he is going to turn on this all-seeing eye, this viewing gallery or peeping tom as I suggest you could call it now, because that is what it will be. There is going to be a problem here for the Minister of Justice in addition to the postmaster who is in charge of the post office when he turns on this all-seeing eye or peeping tom or viewing gallery, as he calls it, namely whether this could be taken to be any offence.

This gentleman is going to be a peeping Tom, and a charge could be laid against him. The first thing we know the Postmaster General may be implicated in the deal, inasmuch as he has authorized it. He is going to commit a very serious offence every time he turns this all-seeing eye or peeping tom on people who are working in the post office, particularly if there are any nice looking ladies in there and they happen to be in a compromising posture. To have this peeping tom in operation may make him liable to a fine of \$500 or maybe a term in jail.

They are going to have a problem that will be very difficult to solve. I hope they are going to get the Minister of Justice and his officials to get them out of the difficulty.

**Mr. Stanton:** I am in complete agreement with the hon. member for Elgin with regard